



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/397,455 | 09/16/1999 | NED M SMITH | 042390.P6764 | 8766 |

7590

01/13/2005

CHARLES A MIRHO INTEL CORPORATION
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMNN LLP
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD 7TH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025

EXAMINER

FIELDS, COURTNEY D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2137

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/397,455

Applicant(s)

SMITH, NED M

Examiner

Courtney D. Fields

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, Van Oorschot (U.S. Patent No. 6,215,872).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1,2, and 4-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grimmer (U.S. Patent No. 5,774,552) in view of Van Oorschot (U.S. Patent No. 6,215,872). As per claims 1 and 20, Grimmer teaches a method for determining whether a key is traceable to one of a set of keys associated with a trusted source in Column 5, lines 8-27, Column 6, lines 28-30, and 52-54, determining whether the key is identified in a list of compromised keys in Column 6, lines 28-30, and if the key is not identified or traceable, assigning the key a trusted source in Column 8, lines 20-33. However, Grimmer fails to specifically teach reading from a software module embedding one of a set of key associated with a trusted source. Van Oorschot teaches a method for creating communities of trust in a secure communication system that includes associated authorities (trusted source), users, and a directory. The software program functions as a certification authority sever or a security manager (software module) in which computer system requests made by the users are verified through the security

manager. The public keys are embedded within the public key certificates. The public key certificate is within the security manager's database. The user's trusted source is associated with the public key within the public key certificate based upon the verification of the security manager as shown in Column 3, lines 57-67, Column 4, lines 1-67, and Column 5, lines 1-22.

Referring to claims 2, 14, and 21, (Grimmer as modified) discloses the claimed limitation of verifying the integrity of a document comprising the key and the list of comprised keys. (See Grimmer, Column 3, lines 25-60)

Referring to claims 4, 16, and 23, (Grimmer as modified) discloses the claimed limitation of tracing the key through a certificate chain to one of the keys in the set of keys. (See Grimmer, Column 5, lines 66-67, Column 6, lines 1-16)

Referring to claim 5, (Grimmer as modified) discloses the claimed limitation of associating a document comprising the key and the set of keys with a software module comprising the set of keys using a hash of the software module in the document. (See Grimmer, Column 3, lines 45-60)

Referring to claim 6, (Grimmer as modified) discloses the claimed limitation in which the document is a manifest signed by the key in Column 4, lines 63-67, Column 5, lines 1-7.

Referring to claim 7, (Grimmer as modified) discloses the claimed limitation of searching the list of compromised keys for the key. (See Grimmer, in Column 7, lines 47-57, Column 8, lines 1-11)

Referring to claims 8, 17, and 24, (Grimmer as modified) discloses the claimed limitation of producing a document comprising an identification of a software module and a list of

comprised keys in and digitally signing the document using a key traceable to one of a set of keys comprised by the software module. (See Grimmer, Column 3, lines 45-67, Column 4, lines 1-4)

Referring to claims 9, 18, and 25, (Grimmer as modified) discloses the claimed limitation in which the identification of the software module comprises a hash value of the software module. (See Grimmer, Column 5, lines 54-65)

Referring to claims 10, 19, and 26, (Grimmer as modified) discloses the claimed limitation in which the key is traceable to one of the set of keys comprised by the software module by way of a certificate chain. (See Grimmer, Column 5, lines 8-27 and Figure 4)

Referring to claim 11, (Grimmer as modified) discloses the claimed limitation of making the document available on a communication network by which computer systems comprising the software module may read the document. (See Van Oorschot, Column 5, lines 23-41)

Referring to claim 12, (Grimmer as modified) discloses the claimed limitation in which the set of keys is embedded within the software module. (See Van Oorschot, Column 4, lines 11-39)

Referring to claim 13, (Grimmer as modified) discloses a device comprising a processor, machine-readable storage for storing instructions (See Grimmer, Column 7, lines 3-11), determine whether a key is traceable to one of a set of keys associated with a trusted source (See Grimmer, Column 5, lines 8-27), determine whether the key is identified in a list of comprised keys and if the key is not identified as comprised and is

Art Unit: 2137

traceable to one of the keys in the set, assign the key a trusted status. (See Grimmer, Column 8, lines 20-33)

Referring to claim 15, (Grimmer as modified) discloses the claimed limitation of comprising a software module comprising the list of keys. (See Grimmer, Column 4, lines 16-20, Column 6, lines 17-27)

Referring to claim 22, (Grimmer as modified) discloses the claimed limitation of reading from a software module embedding the set of keys. (See Van Oorschot, in Column 4, lines 11-39)

Therefore it would have obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to combine Grimmer's trusted source method and Oorschot's software module embedding keys method. Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to this because this will provided trust in secure communication systems, enabling users to obtain trust in public keys of other users and other trusted sources.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Courtney D. Fields whose telephone number is 571-272-3871. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thurs. 6:00 - 4:00 pm; off every Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on 571-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2137

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


cdf

December 30, 2004



**ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**